

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending herein. By this Amendment, claims 1-6 are amended to more further distinguish the invention of the claims over the teaching of the cited references. Claim 11 is amended to correct a typographical error.

No new matter is added by this Amendment.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; (b) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made to further clarify the subject matter of the claimed invention. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Lamb in the June 22, 2004 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,335,795 to Neuhard et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Neuhard"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neuhard describes an apparatus for selecting one of a plurality of printers attached to a server with a user interface program to print a print job. After the user interface program is used to select a print option from a first set of print options, the computer determines a second

set of one or more print options available with the print option selected from the first set. After the user interface program is used to select a print option from the second set, the computer determines all the printers that support the user selected print options. The user interface program is then updated with the printers that support the user selected print options. The user interface program can then be used to select one of the printers that support the user selected print options to print the print job. (See col. 2, lines 33-56). Thus, Neuhard is directed to routing a submitted print job to the appropriate printer in a network printing system when the print attributes of the print job change. By doing so, Neuhard attempts to avoid aborting the print job when the user selected printing attributes are unavailable. (See col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 30).

The Office Action cites to col. 12, lines 6-62 of Neuhard with regard to claims 1, 6 and 11, but nothing in this disclosure describes or suggests a selector for selecting a traverser and the selector selecting policies from a library of applicable policies based on a model of the machine. In addition, with regard to claims 6 and 11, nothing in Neuhard describes or suggests a traverser that traverses a list of valid itineraries to look for a preferred itinerary. Rather, Neuhard is directed to a GUI program 180 querying a status object 182 for available printer models, and in turn the status object 182 queries a cache 184 on the server 6 to obtain information on the printer models available in the network printing system 2. The status object 182 then constructs a model object for each printer model type supported in the network printer system 2.

In the present application, a traverser is a program module that controls machine controller 20 to search for one or more valid itineraries (see page 11, lines 16-17), a policy is used to determine whether the machine has the capabilities required to execute a desired function (see page 11, lines 16-17) and an itinerary includes the specific modules and

capabilities that are needed to process the print job (see page 4, lines 21-22). Nowhere does Neuhard describe or suggest a selector selecting policies from a library of applicable policies and a traverser that traverses or cycles through a list of valid itineraries to look for a preferred itinerary.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Neuhard does not anticipate the subject matter of claims 1, 6, and 11 or claims dependent therefrom.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all of claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Michael G. Harms
Registration No. 51,780

JAO:MGH/hs

Date: July 6, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--